Anomaly in the seniority list of Engineers of CPWD

1023. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the CPWD has recently published a seniority list in 1989. showing the *inter s*e seniority of its engineers at the level of Executive Engineers;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the persons promoted as Executive Engineers in the CPWD in 1979 and onwards and working continuously as such since then do not find a place in the afore-said seniority list whereas persons promoted in 1983 have been included in that list- and

(c) if the answer to (b) above is in the affirmative, the reasons for such anomaly and what steps Government propose to take to correct the same?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI DAULAT RAM SARAN): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c) Yes, Sir. The post of Executive Engineer is filled from two channels, viz., (i) by promotion of Assistant Executive Engineers by seniority-com-fitness; and (ii) by promotion of Assistant Engineers on selection basis. The Supreme Court in its Judgement dated 23rd May, 1984 in the case of P. S. Mahal and others Vs. Union of India and Others had ordered that seniority between Assistant Engineers and Assistant Executive Engineers regularly pro-moted within their respective quota must be determined by the length of continuous officiation of service in the grade of Executive Engineer subject to the qualification that in case of Assistant Engineers the length of continuous officiation shall be reckoned from the date when their promotion is regularised by absorption within their lawful quota. The senioritfiy list of Executive Engineers issued in 1989 has been prepared keeping in view the order of the Supreme Court. While preparing the seniority list vacancy in the grade of Executive Engineer up to 1983 was taken into account. Names of those Executive Engineers who were promoted from the grade of Assistant Engineer in excess of their quota and who were absorbed in their quota up to 1983 have been included. Therefore, there is no anomaly which needs to be corrected. As Assistant Engineers are being promoted on *ad-hoc* basis to the grade of Executive Engineer since 1973 due to seniority disputes their names will be included in the seniority list after regular promotion in the grade of Executive Engineer.

Disparity in promotional avenue of cupying relatively lower position

1024. SHRIMATI BIJOYA CHAKRAVARTY: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that upto 1978 examination the engineers in the C. P. W. D. who were recruited on the basis of the Combined Engineering Services Examination conducted by the UPSC and the person occupying a higher place in the examination were taken in as Assistant Executive Engineers in Class I post and those occupying relatively lower position were placed as Assistant Engineers in Class II post;

(b) whether it is also a fact that a person appointed as Assistant Executive Engineer in 1963 examination on the basis of Combined Engineering Service Examination, is already working as Chief Engineer in the C. P. W. D. whereas another person recruited in the same year on the basis of same examination as Assistant Engineers is still working as Executive Engineers; and

(c) if so, the reasons for such a wide disparity in the promotion prospects of the two categories of officer of Assistant Executive Engineers and Assistant Engineer who are similarly placed and what steps Government propose to take to wipe out this disparity?